

CITY OF SAN BRUNO



567 El Camino Real
San Bruno, CA 94066
Voice: (650) 616-7074
Fax: (650) 873-6749
<http://www.ci.sanbruno.ca.us>

STAFF

Tambri Heyden, AICP, *Community Development Director*
Aaron Akin, AICP, *Planning Manager*
Mark Sullivan, AICP, *Housing and Redevelopment Manager*
Beilin Yu, *Associate Planner*
Lisa Costa-Sanders, *Contract Planner*
Tony Rozzi, *Community Development Technician*
Pamela Thompson, *City Attorney*

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Joe Sammut, *Chair*
Sujendra Mishra, *Vice-Chair*
Mary Lou Johnson
Bob Marshall Jr.
Kevin Chase
Rick Biasotti
Perry Petersen

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

November 15, 2005
San Bruno Senior Center
1555 Crystal Springs Blvd.
7:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER at 7:05 pm

ROLL CALL

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Chair Sammut		X
Vice Chair Mishra	X	
Commissioner Johnson	X	
Commissioner Marshall	X	
Commissioner Chase		X
Commissioner Biasotti	X	
Commissioner Petersen	X	

STAFF PRESENT:

Planning Division: Community Development Director: Tambri Heyden
Planning Manager: Aaron Akin
Associate Planner: Beilin Yu
Community Development Technician: Tony Rozzi

City Attorney: Pamela Thompson

Pledge of Allegiance Commissioner Johnson

1. Approval of Minutes – October 18, 2005

Motion to Approve Minutes of October 18, 2005 Planning Commission meeting

Johnson/Biasotti

VOTE: 5-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

2. Communication

None at this time.

3. Public Comment

None at this time.

4. 121 Portola Way

Request for a Use Permit to allow the construction of an addition which increases the Gross Floor Area by more than 50% and a request for a Minor Modification to allow fifty percent (50%) lot coverage per Sections 12.200.030.B.1 and 12.120.010A of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Joseph Cordero (Applicant/Owner). **UP-05-47; MM-05-18**

Commissioner Petersen recused himself due to a financial interest near the property.

Associate Planner Yu entered staff report.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

Joseph Cordero, applicant, explained his project's scope and pointed out the odd shape of the lot.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked Commission if there were any questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the applicant had spoken to any of the neighbors regarding the project.

Applicant said that he had spoken to a couple of the neighbor whom he knew and they had no objections to the proposal.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the applicant had read and agreed to the Conditions of Approval.

Applicant answered in the affirmative.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked the applicant if he had read and agreed to the Conditions of Approval.

Applicant answered in the affirmative.

Commissioner Biasotti asked staff if there were any comments from the neighboring properties.

Planning Manager Akin answered in the negative.

Associate Planner Yu answered in the negative as well.

Public Comment opened.

Public Comment closed.

Vice-Chair Mishra brought discussion back to the Planning Commission.

Motion to approve Use Permit 05-47 and Minor Modification 05-18 subject to Findings of Fact 1-8 and Conditions of Approval 1-14.

Marshall/Biasotti

VOTE: 4-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN: Petersen recused

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by mailing notices to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on Friday, November 4, 2005, and legal notice published in the San Mateo Times, Saturday, November 5, 2005.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, and Chapter 12.132.

3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The general appearance of the proposed additions is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design and materials will match the materials found in the immediate neighborhood and the proportions of the house are similar to other houses in the neighborhood.
6. The proposed additions will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
7. The construction of the additions is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for single-family residential purposes.
8. The off-street parking is adequate for the proposed residence.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

Community Development Department – (650) 616-7074

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 05-47 and Minor Modification 05-18 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 05-47 and Minor Modification 05-18 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The signed copy of the conditions of approval shall be photocopied and included as a full size page in the Building Division set of drawings.
3. The request for a Use Permit for an addition to an existing dwelling shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on November 15, 2005, labeled Exhibit B except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.

4. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed. The operation of any equipment or performance of any outside construction related to this project shall not exceed a noise level of 85 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or exceed 60 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.
5. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
6. The residence and garage shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence and garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. The garage shall be used for the storage of two (2) motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for code enforcement action, which may result in substantial code compliance costs to bring the garage back into conformance.

Department of Public Works – (650) 616-7065

8. The applicant must obtain an encroachment permit through the Public Works Department prior to issuance of the Building Permit.
9. A sanitary sewer lateral clean-out shall be installed at property line, per City standards detail SS-01.
10. No fence, retaining wall or other permanent structure to be placed within 5'-6" from back of sidewalk. San Bruno Municipal Code 8.08.010
11. During a site visit, it was noticed that a storage shed was built within a Public Utility Easement. In accordance with San Bruno City Code Section 8.08.010 and or Section 5.04.070, this structure is prohibited. You are not required to remove it at this time, you need to be aware that it may be located over top of a public utility. If an emergency does arise that requires City or approved contractor crews to access this utility, the City and or contractor, will not be responsible for any cost associated with the removal or repair of the structure.
12. Storm water from new and existing roof downspouts and other on-site drainage shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water drainage system or through a curb drain to the gutter.
13. Paint address number on face of curb near driveway approach. Black lettering on white background.
14. The project must comply with all future Fire Department conditions, as required during the plan check review by the Building and Safety Department.

City Attorney Thompson advised Vice-Chair Mishra of the 10-day appeal period.

Vice-Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.

Commissioner Petersen returned to the meeting.

5. 232 San Benito Avenue

Request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of a new residence on site, which proposes to increase the Gross Floor Area by more than 50%, per Section 12.200.030.B.1 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. JC Engineering (Applicant); Denis Jordan (Owner). **UP-05-56**

Community Development Technician Rozzi entered staff report.

Commissioner Johnson recused herself from the item being that the location was within a 500-foot radius of her property.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Marshall asked for clarification regarding staff's mention of the tree and possible removal.

Community Development Technician Rozzi answered that the said tree is located to the rear of the property and could pose a danger because of falling limbs. In the past, a limb had fallen into the backyard of one of the adjacent properties.

Commissioner Marshall mentioned that this should be a City arborist issue.

City Attorney Thompson stated that a permit is required and the City recommendation is that the City arborist make a formal determination and forward it to the Community Development Director if the applicant did not agree to remove the tree.

Commissioner Marshall asked if the tree would still need to be removed if staff determined it did not pose a threat.

City Attorney Thompson explained that there has been an allegation that the tree poses a threat and so the City arborist would need to make a formal determination as to whether they agree or not. There could be a Condition of Approval added if the City wanted the tree removed for other reasons.

Commissioner Marshall remarked that adding a Condition as mentioned had never been done before.

City Attorney Thompson clarified that it has been done before, in the context of project planning and proposed structures.

Commissioner Marshall asked where the tree was located.

Applicant answered that it was in the right, rear corner of the lot.

Community Development Technician Rozzi mentioned that the applicant was available to answer any further questions.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

Denis Jordan, applicant, explained the proposed project and clarified the tree problem. Applicant would like to remove it but it is very tall and hard to access.

Commissioner Marshall asked if the applicant would like to remove the tree, regardless of City arborist's determination.

Applicant answered in the affirmative. They will remove the tree as long as the City approves it and a permit can be issued.

City Attorney Thompson added that a permit would be required for the tree's removal as long as this is added as a Condition of Approval.

Commissioner Petersen asked for clarification regarding lines near the property line on the plot plan.

Staff and the applicant reviewed the plans and decided that they were remnant lines from an earlier draft.

Commissioner Petersen asked for further clarification on other lines drawn on the plot plan.

Staff and the applicant reviewed the plans and agreed that they were not applicable to the proposal.

Commissioner Petersen noted for the record that there were a number of lines on the proposed project plans on sheet 2 that did not pertain to the application.

Public Comment opened.

Public Comment closed.

Vice-Chair Mishra brought discussion back to the Planning Commission.

Motion to approve Use Permit 05-56 subject to Findings of Fact 1-9 and Conditions of Approval 1-23 to include the additional Condition of Approval requesting the applicant to obtain a City permit to remove the tree in the rear yard.

Marshall/Biasotti

Commissioner Petersen stated that though the application has merit, the extraneous drawings on the plans do not lend confidence to the project and he must deny it.

VOTE: 3-1
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES: Petersen
ABSTAIN: Johnson recused

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by mailing notices to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on Friday, November 4, 2005, and legal notice published in the San Mateo Times, Saturday, November 5, 2005.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, and Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The general appearance of the proposed residence is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design and materials will complement the existing structure and the proportions of the house are similar to other houses in the neighborhood.
6. The proposed residence will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
7. The construction of the new residence is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for low-density residential purposes.
8. Existing off-street parking is adequate for the proposed residence.
9. Property is in the San Bruno Redevelopment Area and the proposed improvements are consistent with the San Bruno Redevelopment Plan.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

Community Development Department – (650) 616-7074

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 05-56 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 05-56 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The signed copy of the conditions of approval shall be photocopied and included as a full size page in the Building Division set of drawings.
3. The request for a Use Permit for a new second dwelling shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on November 15, 2005, labeled Exhibit B except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
4. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed. The operation of any equipment or performance of any outside construction related to this project shall not exceed a noise level of 85 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or exceed 60 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.
5. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
6. The second residence shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit. There can be no more than two units on site.
7. The two garages shall be used for the storage of four (4) motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for code enforcement action, which may result in substantial code compliance costs to bring the garage back into conformance.

Department of Public Works – (650) 616-7065

8. Install a sanitary sewer lateral clean-out at property line per City standards detail SS-01.
9. Storm water from new and existing roof downspouts and other on-site drainage shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water drainage system or through

an under sidewalk curb drain to the gutter. Alternatively, Applicant may work with Public Works to design a system that drains to landscape.

10. The applicant must obtain an encroachment permit through the Public Works Department prior to issuance of the Building Permit.
11. Replace all broken or raised concrete in sidewalk or driveway approach as marked per San Bruno Municipal Code 8.12.010, City Standards 7 & 8.
12. No fence, retaining wall or other permanent structures to be placed within 2' from back of sidewalk. San Bruno Municipal Code 8.08.010.
13. Paint address number on face of curb near driveway approach. Black lettering on white background.
14. Planting of one (1) 36-inch box size tree or payment of equal value to tree fund for trees and installation.
15. Applicant shall pay water and sewer capacity charges based on the size of the water meter installed along with materials and installation of water meter.
16. During the Building/Planning Review or site visit, it was noticed that you have a fence/brick work built within the City right-of-way. In accordance with San Bruno City Code Section 8.08.010 and or section 5.04.070, this structure is prohibited. You are not required to remove it at this time but you need to be aware that it may be located over top of a public utility. If an emergency does arise that requires City or approved contractor crews to access this utility, the City and or contractor will not be responsible for any costs associated with the removal or repair of the structure. Municipal Code 10.08.100

Fire Department - (650) 616-7096

17. Fire Sprinklers according to NFPA 13D in Unit 2 are required.
18. Fire Sprinklers according to NFPA 13D in Unit 1 are recommended.
19. Provide sprinkler coverage in the garage and attic.
20. Provide water flow alarm using exterior rated horn and strobe visible from the street. Retard the alarm 45 to 60 seconds.
21. Illuminated address numbers are to be visible from the street.
22. The project must comply with all future Fire Department conditions, as required during the plan check review by the Building and Safety Department.

Planning Commission

23. Applicant shall have City arborist make a formal determination on the removal of a large tree in the rear yard and forward it to the Community Development Director. Applicant shall obtain permit to remove said tree if deemed applicable by City arborist.

Vice-Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.

Commissioner Johnson returned to the meeting.

6. 3421 Crestmoor Drive

Request for a Use Permit to allow the construction of an addition which increases the Gross Floor Area by more than 50% and exceeds the .55 Floor Area Ratio guideline, per Sections 12.200.030.B.1 and 12.200.030.B.2 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Steven Lesley (Applicant); Chris and Nina Keys (Owners). **UP-05-59**

Associate Planner Yu entered staff report.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

Steven Lesley, applicant, explained that they are happy with the recommendations of staff and are available for any questions.

Commissioner Marshall asked for color and roofing material samples.

Applicant provided samples to the Commission.

Vice-Chair Mishra stated that during the Architectural Review Committee meeting, one of the comments was to add articulation to the second floor window on the front elevation. Vice-Chair Mishra asked for clarification on this change to the plans.

Applicant answered that the new window is a much more pronounced design and is larger than before. This was done by rearranging the master bathroom to accommodate a larger window.

Vice-Chair Mishra felt that shutters on the window might best tie the windows together.

Commissioner Marshall stated that there would not be room for shutters.

Applicant agreed and felt that the different architectural features used kept the design from becoming boring.

Commissioner Johnson asked for clarification on the door's design and paneling.

Applicant answered that it would be a paneled double door.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked why the rear windows did not have any grids on them.

Applicant answered that this was intentional, to maintain the excellent view from the rear of the home.

Commissioner Marshall agreed that that the rear of the home would not be visible to the public.

Commissioner Petersen stated that a number of applications in this neighborhood were on the larger size and wanted to know if the applicant knew the FAR guideline was .55 by City Ordinance prior to design.

Applicant answered that he was aware of the .55 FAR guideline but having a useable second story was important to his client and staff was in approval of the design.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked the applicant if he had read and agreed to the Conditions of Approval.

Applicant answered in the affirmative.

Public Comment opened.

Public Comment closed.

Vice-Chair Mishra brought discussion back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Petersen stated that the application has merit but that there should be an additional Condition of Approval that the applicant setback the second story to better blend with the existing home. This would make the home appear larger even though the proposal exceeds the Floor Area Ratio guideline.

Commissioner Marshall added an amendment that this project's .66 FAR does not have a major impact because of the large greenbelt area behind the home.

Commissioner Petersen accepted the amendment to the additional Condition of Approval.

Motion to approve Use Permit 05-59 subject to Findings of Fact 1-8 and Conditions of Approval 1-15 to include the additional Condition of Approval requiring a second story setback.

Petersen/Marshall

VOTE: 5-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:

ABSTAIN:

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by mailing notices to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on Friday, November 4, 2005, and legal notice published in the San Mateo Times, Saturday, November 5, 2005.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, and Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The general appearance of the proposed addition is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design and materials will match the materials found in the immediate neighborhood and the proportions of the house are similar to other houses in the neighborhood.
6. The proposed addition will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
7. The construction of the addition is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for single-family residential purposes.
8. The off-street parking is adequate for the residence.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

Community Development Department – (650) 616-7074

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 05-59 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 05-59 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.

2. The signed copy of the conditions of approval shall be photocopied and included as a full size page in the Building Division set of drawings.
3. The request for a Use Permit for an addition to an existing dwelling shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on November 15, 2005, labeled Exhibit B except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
4. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed. The operation of any equipment or performance of any outside construction related to this project shall not exceed a noise level of 85 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or exceed 60 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.
5. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
6. The residence and garage shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence and garage shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. The garage shall be used for the storage of two (2) motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for code enforcement action, which may result in substantial code compliance costs to bring the garage back into conformance.
8. The second story window on the right side elevation shall be raised. The bottom of the window shall be located at least 60" from the second story's finished floor.

Department of Public Works – (650) 616-7065

9. The applicant must obtain an encroachment permit through the Public Works Department prior to issuance of the Building Permit.
10. No fence, retaining wall or other permanent structures to be placed within 5'6" from back of sidewalk. San Bruno Municipal Code 8.08.010.
11. A sanitary sewer lateral clean-out shall be installed at property line, per City standards detail SS-01.
12. Storm water from new and existing roof downspouts and other on-site drainage shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water drainage system or through a curb drain to the gutter.
13. Planting of one (1) 36-inch box size tree or payment of equal value to tree fund for tree(s) and installation.

14. During the Building/Planning review or site visit, it was noticed that you have brick planters built within the City public right-of-way. In accordance with San Bruno City Code Section 8.08.010 and or Section 5.04.070, this structure is prohibited. You are not required to remove it at this time, you need to be aware that it may be located over top of a public utility. If an emergency does arise that requires City or approved contractor crews to access this utility, the City and or contractor, will not be responsible for any cost associated with the removal or repair of the structure.

Planning Commission

15. The applicant shall redesign the project to setback the second story from the first to meet Zoning Ordinance requirements. This, along with the adjacent greenbelt, shall mitigate any bulk or mass associated with the .66 FAR, which exceeds the City's Zoning Ordinance guideline.

Vice-Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.

7. 268 E. Angus Avenue

Request for a Use Permit to allow the construction of an addition, which increases the Gross Floor Area by more than 50%, a Minor Modification approval to continue an existing 3'-6" side yard setback and a Parking Exception to allow tandem garage parking per Sections 12.200.030.B.1, 12.120.010.B and 12.200.080.C of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Ken Ibarra (Applicant); Ramon Hernandez (Owner). **UP-05-60; MM-05-19; PE-05-09.**

Community Development Technician Tony Rozzi entered staff report.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Marshall asked if the garage access door should be to the rear of the garage rather than on the side.

Planning Manager Akin answered that typically the City will require that the door swing into the home, rather than into the garage, allowing full access.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

Ramon Hernandez, applicant, thanked staff for their recommendation and stated that he and his wife had read and agreed to the Conditions of Approval. Applicant explained that they have spoken to their immediate neighbors and they are in support of the project. They have decided to expand to a second floor because their children enjoy the backyard. Applicant provided samples of roofing material and paint colors. Regarding the garage door, the side access is best for entry into the home and it will swing into the home.

Commissioner Marshall asked staff for the standard dimensions of a garage space.

Planning Manager Aknin answered that the standard is 10 feet wide by 20 feet in length. A tandem garage would need to be 40 feet long.

Community Development Technician Rozzi added that the proposed garage meets City requirements.

Public Comment opened.

Public Comment closed.

Vice-Chair Mishra brought discussion back to the Planning Commission.

Motion to approve Use Permit 05-60, Minor Modification 05-19 and Parking Exception 05-09 subject to Findings of Fact 1-11 and Conditions of Approval 1-14.

Petersen/Johnson

VOTE: 5-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by mailing notices to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on Friday, November 4, 2005, and legal notice published in the San Mateo Times, Saturday, November 5, 2005.
2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, and Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The general appearance of the proposed residence is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design and materials will complement the existing structure and the proportions of the house are similar to other houses in the neighborhood.

6. The proposed residence will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
7. The construction of the new residence is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for single-family residential purposes.
8. Proposed off-street parking is adequate for the proposed addition.
9. Property is in the San Bruno Redevelopment Area and the proposed improvements are consistent with the San Bruno Redevelopment Plan.
10. The strict application of the provisions of this chapter (San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.100) would cause particular difficulty or undue hardship in connection with the use and enjoyment of said property;

Reason: The applicant is proposing to extend the garage and provide tandem parking to meet the required two (2) off street parking spaces. The number of parking spaces provided onsite is consistent with other residences located near the subject property.

11. The establishment, maintenance and/or conducting of the off street parking facilities as proposed are as nearly in compliance with the requirements set forth in this chapter (San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.100) as are reasonably possible with tandem parking.

Reason: The applicant is proposing to extend the garage and provide tandem parking to meet the required two (2) off street parking spaces. The number of parking spaces provided onsite is consistent with other residences located near the subject property.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

Community Development Department – (650) 616-7074

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 05-60, Minor Modification 05-19 and Parking Exception 05-09 shall not be valid for any purpose. UP-05-60, MM-05-19, PE-05-09 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The signed copy of the conditions of approval shall be photocopied and included as a full size page in the Building Division set of drawings.
3. The request for a Use Permit, Minor Modification and Parking Exception for a residential addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning

Commission on November 15, 2005, labeled Exhibit B except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.

4. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed. The operation of any equipment or performance of any outside construction related to this project shall not exceed a noise level of 85 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or exceed 60 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.
5. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
6. The residence shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. The tandem garage shall be used for the storage of two (2) motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for code enforcement action, which may result in substantial code compliance costs to bring the garage back into conformance.

Department of Public Works – (650) 616-7065

8. Install a sanitary sewer lateral clean-out at property line per City standards detail SS-01.
9. Storm water from new and existing roof downspouts and other on-site drainage shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water drainage system or through an under sidewalk curb drain to the gutter. Alternatively, Applicant may work with Public Works to design a system that drains to landscape.
10. The applicant must obtain an encroachment permit through the Public Works Department prior to issuance of the Building Permit.
11. Replace all broken or raised concrete in sidewalk or driveway approach as marked per San Bruno Municipal Code 8.12.010, City Standards 7 & 8.
12. No fence, retaining wall or other permanent structures to be placed within 2' from back of sidewalk. San Bruno Municipal Code 8.08.010.
13. Paint address number on face of curb near driveway approach. Black lettering on white background.
14. Planting of one (1) 36-inch box size tree or payment of equal value to tree fund for trees and installation.

Vice-Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.

8. 788 Masson Avenue

Request for a Use Permit and Parking Exception to allow the construction of a new residence, which proposes to exceed the .55 Floor Area Ratio guideline, where the second story front façade is not setback 5'-0" from the first story front façade, and to allow tandem garage per Sections 12.200.030.B.2, 12.200.040.B.2 and 12.200.080.C of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. Luis A. Robles (Applicant); George Sahourieh (Owner). **UP-05-61; PE-05-07**

Associate Planner Beilin Yu entered staff report.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Marshall asked for clarification on the front porch design.

Staff recommended that the applicant could best answer this question.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

George Sahourieh, owner and Luis Robles, applicant explained that they are happy to answer any of the Commission's questions. Applicant asked that on Condition of Approval 10, Masson Street be reflected as the correct street.

Commissioner Petersen answered in the affirmative.

Commissioner Johnson stated that because this is an empty lot, the Commission likes to see a new home meet as any of the City Zoning Ordinances as possible.

Commissioner Johnson requested an explanation as to why the second floor setback was not met.

Applicant answered that the adjacent homes are not setback but they are happy to comply. They would redesign the home to be setback and replace the rear balcony that is currently proposed.

Commissioner Johnson answered that it is best to set a standard for meeting the City Zoning Ordinance and not just meeting the standard for a given neighborhood.

Commissioner Johnson added that aesthetically, this could be a pleasing architectural feature that helps the home stand out from the neighborhood.

Applicant asked if a balcony could be designed in the front then to maximize the setback space.

Commissioner Johnson recommended that staff help design such a feature.

Planning Manager Aknin explained that a front balcony must not exceed 72 square feet.

Commissioner Marshall offered his agreement to Commissioner Johnson's comments. The two other properties near this proposal have used a similar front balcony to setback the second story.

Applicant was in support of this suggestion.

Commissioner Marshall asked staff for clarification on how this design would need to be approved.

Planning Manager Akin answered that this change could be reflected in the Building Division set of plans and staff would verify compliance then.

Public Comment opened.

Public Comment closed.

Vice-Chair Mishra brought discussion back to the Planning Commission.

Motion to approve Use Permit 05-61 and Parking Exception 05-07 subject to Findings of Fact 1-10 and Conditions of Approval 1-16 to include the additional Condition of Approval to setback the second story from the first story.

Commissioner Marshall suggested that approval of a setback change to the front façade require an Architectural Review Committee meeting.

Planning Manager answered in the affirmative. Proposed project will be scheduled for the next applicable Architectural Review Committee meeting.

Commissioner Johnson asked if this would be a final approval.

Planning Manager Akin answered in the affirmative.

Johnson/Marshall

VOTE: 5-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by mailing notices to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on Friday, November 4, 2005, and legal notice published in the San Mateo Times, Saturday, November 5, 2005.

2. Noticing of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, and Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor expansion to an existing facility.
5. The general appearance of the proposed residence is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will not be detrimental to the adjacent real property because the design and materials will match the materials found in the immediate neighborhood and the proportions of the house are similar to other houses in the neighborhood.
6. The proposed residence will not unreasonably restrict or interfere with light and air on the property and other properties in the neighborhood, will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, and is consistent with the design and scale of the neighborhood.
7. The construction of the new residence is consistent with the San Bruno General Plan, which designates the property for single-family residential purposes.
8. The off-street parking is adequate for the proposed residence.
9. The strict application of the provisions of this chapter (San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.100) would cause particular difficulty or undue hardship in connection with the use and enjoyment of said property;

Reason: The applicant is proposing to provide tandem parking to meet the required two (2) off street parking spaces. The number of parking spaces provided onsite is consistent with other residences located near the subject property.

10. The establishment, maintenance and/or conducting of the off street parking facilities as proposed are as nearly in compliance with the requirements set forth in this chapter (San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.100) as are reasonably possible with tandem parking.

Reason: The applicant is proposing to provide tandem parking to meet the required two (2) off street parking spaces. The number of parking spaces provided onsite is consistent with other residences located near the subject property.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

Community Development Department – (650) 616-7074

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Department of Planning and Building within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 05-61 and Parking Exception 05-07 shall not be valid for any purpose. Use Permit 05-55 and Parking Exception 05-07 shall expire one (1) year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless a building permit has been secured prior to the one (1) year date.
2. The signed copy of the conditions of approval shall be photocopied and included as a full size page in the Building Division set of drawings.
3. The request for a Use Permit for an addition shall be built according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on November 15, 2005, labeled Exhibit B except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
4. The applicant shall obtain a City of San Bruno building permit before construction can proceed. The operation of any equipment or performance of any outside construction related to this project shall not exceed a noise level of 85 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. or exceed 60 decibels (as measured at 100 feet) from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.
5. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
6. The residence shall be used only as a single-family residential dwelling unit. No portion of the residence shall be rented out as a secondary residential dwelling unit.
7. The garage shall be used for the storage of motor vehicles and shall not be used as habitable living space as defined in the Uniform Building Code. Failure to conform to this condition is grounds for code enforcement action, which may result in substantial code compliance costs to bring the garage back into conformance.

Department of Public Works – (650) 616-7065

8. The applicant must obtain an encroachment permit through the Public Works Department prior to issuance of the Building Permit.
9. A sanitary sewer lateral clean-out shall be installed at property line, per City standards detail SS-01.
10. Paint address number on face of Masson Avenue curb near driveway approach. Black lettering on white background.

11. Remove weeds and grass from sidewalk, curb and gutter. Prune other plantings in public right-of-way.
12. Replace all broken or raised concrete in sidewalk or driveway approach as marked per San Bruno Municipal Code 8.12.010, City Standards 7 & 8. Marking shall take place under Building Department review.
13. Storm water from new and existing roof downspouts and other on-site drainage shall be collected and drained to an underground storm water drainage system or through a curb drain to the gutter. Drain to landscape or bubble-up 2'-0" behind sidewalk allowed.
14. No fence, retaining wall or other permanent structure shall be placed within 2'-0" from back of the sidewalk.
15. Planting of one (1) 36-inch box size tree or payment of equal value to tree fund for tree(s) and installation.

Planning Commission

16. The applicant shall redesign the project to setback the second story from the first to meet Zoning Ordinance requirements. This shall mitigate any bulk or mass associated with the .71 FAR, which exceeds the City's Zoning Ordinance guideline. Approval shall be required at the next applicable Architectural Review Committee meeting.

Vice-Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.

9. 166 Riviera Court

Request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a large family day care operation in a single family residential zone; per Section 12.84.200 of the San Bruno Zoning Ordinance. – Naila & Walid Nimri (Owner/Applicant). **UP 05-50**

Planning Manager Aknin entered staff report.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Marshall asked for clarification regarding an auxiliary kitchen area.

Planning Manager Aknin answered that it was a wet bar area only.

Vice-Chair Mishra asked the applicant to address the Commission and introduce the project.

Naila & Walid Nimri, applicant, greeted the Commission and read a prepared statement.

Commissioner Petersen inquired about the hours of operation.

Applicant answered that they would be in operation from 7 A.M. until 6 P.M., Monday through Friday.

Commissioner Marshall asked for clarification regarding the number of customers a Large Child Care facility could have at one time and that relation to the 14 child maximum.

Applicant answered that the limit is 14 children at one time but there could be more than 14 clients who used the facility.

Commissioner Johnson inquired whether there was cement in the rear of the yard and if the applicant planned to use a ground covering to mitigate noise levels. Questions were also asked about a schedule that could be submitted to the neighbors and Planning Department, which would be useful to educate the neighbors. Commissioner Johnson then requested an explanation of the outside supervision, number of employees and the employee parking.

Applicant answered that the rear yard is mostly grass with a large backyard. The children will play there if the weather permits though most of the time, the weather is not very nice and the children remain indoors. Applicant also answered that they could make a schedule and they will certainly provide one to the Planning Department and the neighborhood. Off street parking will be met by their two-car garage, since there will only be one of the applicant's vehicles and the one employee's vehicle.

Commissioner Johnson asked the applicant to clarify what the ratio of supervisors to children would be.

Applicant answered that there would be a 1:8 ratio of supervisor to children. Regarding parking, the families picking up their children will be able to use the large driveway to park, thus keeping the street clear.

Commissioner Johnson stated that it was state law that the parents sign in and sign out when they pick up and drop off their children. This prevents honking and loud noises during pick up hours.

Applicant explained that she has a list of rules that are given to the parents and the childcare facility works well with them. Applicant added that though they are applying for a large childcare use permit, they do not expect to have 14 children at any one time. In the future, they would like to, but for now they are simply trying to expand their business beyond the 8-child maximum.

Commissioner Johnson clarified that their goal is indeed to have 14 children at one time in the future.

Applicant answered in the affirmative.

Planning Manager Aknin requested an amendment to Conditions of Approval requiring that Employee's park on site.

Vice-Chair Mishra answered in the affirmative.

Commissioner Johnson added that this would limit the capacity of parents to pick up their children and park on site if an employee was taking up that space.

Planning Manager Aknin answered that there were off-street parking options as well as a large driveway for the parents to park in.

Vice-Chair Mishra would like to add a Condition of Approval (to the 19th) that prohibits parking on the lawn and that it must be in the designated area. Secondly, Vice-Chair Mishra asked for clarification regarding a retaining wall in the rear yard.

Applicant answered that there was a small retaining wall in good condition and that it was located in the rear of the yard away from the playground.

Commissioner Johnson inquired about an abandoned fireplace, as indicated on the submitted plans.

Applicant explained that there was a gate blocking the fireplace and the raised fireplace hearth is covered in pillows to block access to the children and provide padding. Applicant added that children couldn't climb on it.

Public Comment opened.

Edith Mock, neighbor at 176 Riviera Court, submitted a signed list of five (5) neighbors opposing the expanded childcare facility. She had serious traffic concerns and worries about losing her peaceful home environment. Her dog has died, the children have moved out and they are retired. They just want a quiet home.

Edna Dagna, neighbor at 126 Riviera Court, opposes the expansion because of the parking problem it will create.

Barbara Maruco, 341 Portland Drive and client of the childcare facility at 166 Riviera, is in support of the expansion. Noise is nominal and the children are quiet when they are outside. She uses the day care facility herself and there has never been a traffic issue. With so few affordable options, she would like to see this business expand and help others like her.

Public Comment closed.

Commissioner Marshall asked one of the opposing neighbors to clarify their noise complaint when no other complaints have been made to staff.

Edith Mock answered that until now, there has been no serious noise issue. But her concerns are for the additional traffic that may come in with the expanded business.

Commissioner Petersen wanted to verify with one of the opposing neighbors if they felt traffic would change the character of the neighborhood.

Edith Mock answered in the affirmative. Parking constraints create a major problem in the court already and she is not in support of increased traffic.

Applicant added that initially, when they applied for the Use permit, staff recommended that they speak to the neighbors first. When the applicant spoke to one of the opposing neighbors, they said that they were unaware that a home day care was even in operation in the neighborhood.

Public Comment closed

Commissioner Biasotti asked the applicant to explain the age range of the children at the facility.

Applicant answered that it will range from infants to ten (10) year old children.

Planning Manager Akin repeated the answer on microphone for the television audience.

Commissioner Marshall asked staff if the number of total clients could be limited for the child care facility.

City Attorney Thompson answered that the land use could not necessarily be regulated. She requested time to research the issue though her initial advice would be that something like this would not be an appropriate limitation.

Commissioner Petersen added that the concern of traffic, noise and parking is not an infrequent issue and in the past, a six (6) month review on the Use Permit approval has been an added Condition of Approval.

City Attorney Thompson advised the Commission that this would essentially become a Temporary Use Permit then. City Attorney Thompson also expressed that she was not sure of the efficacy of such a Condition of Approval.

Commissioner Petersen expressed his desire to turn down a project rather than approve it and allow its future to be unknown. By allowing only a Temporary Use Permit, the Commission would retain some authority concerning the project's merit.

City Attorney Thompson clarified that an added Condition of Approval requiring a six (6) month review might be the best alternative. The conditions could always be adjusted at that time then.

Commissioner Petersen added that any permit can be brought up for revocation if needed and this could be done in the future if problems arise with the proposed Use Permit.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the difficulty with this application is centered on the fact that the residence is located in a Cul-de-sac. Parking and traffic are always an issue. Regarding a six (6) month review, this could have a problematic effect on clients at the day care facility if the Use Permit were to come up for revocation. Commissioner Johnson also added that monitoring the number of visits by parents to the facility would be very problematic and almost impossible to monitor by the Planning Commission.

Applicant spoke out of turn and said that the Four Seas does not allow visits from any family members.

Vice-Chair Mishra verified that this is listed in the facility's rules.

Motion to approve Use Permit 05-50 subject to Findings of Fact 1-9 and Conditions of Approval 1-19 to include the additional Condition of Approval for a six (6) month review with staff report and Planning Commission analysis

Vice-Chair Mishra added an amendment to the motion to require employees to park on site as Condition of Approval 20.

Commissioner Petersen accepted the amendment.

Motion to approve Use Permit 05-50 subject to Findings of Fact 1-9 and Conditions of Approval 1-20

Petersen/Marshall

Commissioner Biasotti asked staff what resource any concerned neighbor could contact regarding questions or issues with this project.

Planning Manager Akin answered that he would personally answer any questions.

Commissioner Petersen added that he is sympathetic to cul-de-sac residents and their parking problems. With this type of Use Permit request, a six (6) month review is applicable, as problems sometimes arise.

Planning Manager Akin requested clarification on how the Commission would like staff to analyze the Use Permit and the Conditions of Approval if the project were approved with a six (6) month review.

Commissioner Petersen asked that the staff report reflect the reality of the Use Permit and if the Conditions of Approval are being met and not adversely impacting the neighborhood.

Commissioner Johnson clarified some of the names, addresses and signatures of letters in support and against the proposed project.

Planning Manager Aknin explained the discrepancies as being from different individuals in the same household and that these discrepancies were noted.

VOTE: 5-0
AYES: All Commissioners Present
NOES:
ABSTAIN:

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

1. Proper notice of the public hearing was given by mailing notices to property owners within 300 feet of the project site on Friday, November 4, 2005, and legal notice published in the San Mateo Times, Saturday, November 5, 2005.
2. Notice of the public hearing, conduct of said hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to present testimony was completed in accordance with the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Zoning, Chapter 12.132.
3. The applicant has been notified, both verbally and in writing herein, of the City's provision for an administrative appeal of the Planning Commission's final action to the City Council as provided for in the San Bruno Municipal Code, Article III, Chapter 12.140.
4. The project is Categorically Exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Class 1, Section 15301: Minor Expansion to Existing Facilities.
5. The use permit to operate a large family day care home at the house located at 166 Riviera Court at is located in a residential district.
6. The use permit to operate a large family day care home at the house at 166 Riviera Court will not result in undue negative impacts upon the neighborhood vicinity in terms of traffic, parking, and noise.
7. The subject property contains a driveway where at least two vehicles can be to allow children to be picked up or dropped off.
8. The existing home complies with applicable off-street parking standards of the zoning code since the subject property contains an attached two car garage
9. Based on a site inspection by the Fire Department staff, with the conditions of approval, the existing home complies with applicable building and fire code provisions.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

Community Development Department - (650) 616-7074

1. The applicant shall file a declaration of acceptance of the following conditions by submitting a signed copy of the Summary of Hearing to the Community Development Department within 30 days of Planning Commission approval. Until such time as the Summary is filed, Use Permit 05-50 shall not be valid for any purpose.
2. Applicant must obtain a business license through the Finance Department.
3. The request for a use permit for a large family day care home at 166 Riviera Court shall operate according to plans approved by the Planning Commission on November 15, 2005, labeled Exhibit B except as required to be modified by these Conditions of Approval. Any modification to the approved plans shall require prior approval by the Community Development Director.
4. Parents and guardians dropping off and picking up children from the home shall be directed to not honk their car horn. Neighborhood noise complaints could result in this application being called back up to the Planning Commission for revocation.
5. Parents and guardians dropping off and picking up children from the home must park on the driveway when picking up and dropping off their children. In the event the driveway is not available, the parents shall use the parking area directly in front of the home.
6. Prior to Final Inspection, all pertinent conditions of approval and all improvements shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of San Bruno.
7. Children shall be supervised when outdoors to control noise levels.
8. The applicant shall obtain a license from the State of California to operate a large home family day care center.
9. The number of children shall be limited to a maximum of fourteen (14) at any one time, including any of the applicant's own children.
10. Children outdoors shall be supervised at all times.
11. Property owners must park their personal vehicles in the garage during daycare hours.

Fire Department - (650) 616-7096

12. Provide illuminated address numbers visible from the street.
13. Provide a manual pull station with a horn and strobe. Installation will require an electrical permit.
14. Provide two clear exit pathways to front sidewalk.

15. Provide single action locking devices on front and rear doors.
16. A fire extinguisher must be mounted on a wall in a visible location.
17. Smoke detectors are required in all rooms, except the kitchen, bathroom and furnace room.
18. Provide an inside latch for the metal gate and remove the exterior hasp locking device.

Planning Commission

19. Employees must park personal vehicles on-site during daycare facility hours of operation.
20. Staff shall conduct a six (6) month review of Use Permit 05-50 and submit report to the Planning Commission reflecting the applicant's adherence to the Conditions of Approval and any impacts on the surrounding neighborhood.

Vice-Chair Mishra advised of a 10-day appeal period.

10. City Staff Discussion

Planning Manager Akin requested volunteers for Architectural Review Committee Members.

Commissioners Biasotti, Petersen and Vice-Chair Mishra volunteered with Commissioner Johnson as back up.

11. Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Marshall requested that a neighborhood meeting be mandatory when applying for a Large Residential Child Care facility and look into ways that the Commission can limit the number of clients for a child care facility.

City Attorney Thompson volunteered to look into the issue and followed up on her comments regarding a Temporary Use Permit to explain that the six (6) month review is the best policy to use at this time.

Commissioner Johnson welcomed new Community Development Director Tambri Heyden.

Commissioner Biasotti mentioned that he has been working with Community Development Technician Rozzi to prepare Planning Commission Packets for electronic delivery. He asked the other Commissioners to express their interest and whether this should be something that staff pursues.

Commissioner Petersen and Marshall requested official laptops for plan reviews during the meetings.

Commissioner Biasotti thought that paper plans would be good to have at the meetings but for access, electronically distributed packets work very well.

Commissioner Petersen added that he would also like to request a WiFi account.

Vice-Chair Mishra explained that some cities require PDF formats of all plan submissions as well and this could be an asset to the city and electronic distribution.

Commissioner Johnson is open to any changes but would like to know how additional correspondence would be included in the electronic packets. She does appreciate the paper plans however.

Planning Manager Akin added that for the time being, Staff would issue the electronic formats to the Commissioners as well as paper copies.

Vice-Chair Mishra added that this would aid in personal storage of agendas, plans and staff reports for the Commissioners.

Commissioner Biasotti suggested that everyone receive an e-packet and that any commissioners who would not like paper copies also note that with staff.

Planning Manager Akin answered in the affirmative.

Vice-Chair Mishra added that when emailed the packets, all the Commissioners should be on a Blind-Carbon-Copy (bcc:) to prevent any discussion outside of the Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Biasotti thanked Community Development Technician Rozzi for his work on the e-packet project.

Community Development Technician Rozzi added that large plans would be available at all the meetings for any Commissioners who have chosen to only use the e-packet.

12. Adjournment

Tambri Heyden
Interim Secretary to the Planning
Commission
City of San Bruno

Joe Sammut, Chair
Planning Commission
City of San Bruno

NEXT MEETING: December 20, 2005

TH/tr

Meeting was adjourned at 8:46 pm